

REMARKS

In view of the preceding amendments and the following comments, and pursuant to 37 C. F. R. § 1.111, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the Office Action mailed November 28, 2005.

Summary

After amendment by Applicants, Claims 1-3 and 5-26 stand rejected. Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 and Claim 14. Applicants have also cancelled dependent Claim 17 and dependent Claim 18. Claim 17 was dependent on independent Claim 14; Claim 18 was dependent on Claim 17. Claim 14 has been amended to include the limitations of Claim 17 and Claim 18. Applicants have also amended Claim 1 and Claim 14 by replacing the phrase "publicly distributed network" with "Internet" to clarify and remove ambiguities concerning Applicants' invention. No new matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments. Reconsideration of pending Claims 1-3, 5-14, and 19-26 and allowance is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Interview Summary

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for granting a telephone interview on March 3, 2006 to discuss the Office Action with the undersigned attorney. During the course of the interview, the Applicants and Examiner discussed independent Claim 1 and independent Claim 14, and the art applied against those claims. No agreement was reached.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-14, and 19-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,834) in view of Graham et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0205537), and in further view of Kitain et al. (U.S. Patent No.

5,864,871). Although Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, Applicants have amended independent Claim 14 to include the limitations of dependent Claim 17 and dependent Claim 18.

Amended Claim 14 is generally directed to a method of generating customized personal Web homepages. Claim 14 recites that the method comprises providing an existing human resources database, defining a template of a personal homepage, identifying a member of a sales force, and retrieving from the human resources database personal data associated with the identified sales force member. Claim 14 further recites that the method comprises automatically generating a personal homepage for the identified sales force member and making that homepage accessible through the Internet. Claim 14 also recites that the homepage is updated with personal data that is periodically retrieved from the human resources database and that the homepage is disabled for any viewing on the Internet when the personal data indicates that the identified sales force member is no longer employed.

With respect to independent Claim 1, the Examiner has admitted that Pinard in view of Graham "fails to explicitly teach using the information to control access by disabling the web page from viewing on the network." Office Action mailed November 28, 2005, p.6. However, to fill this gap, the Examiner states that Kitain "discloses disabling access to a web page from viewing on a network," and therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to "combine the personal web page system of Pinard and Graham with the Information delivery system of Kitain in order to 'an integrated information delivery system that meets the needs of both corporations (to have annual reports and other corporate information delivered to interested investors, advisors, and analysts) and of investors.'" *Id.* at pp. 6-7.

Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully submit that Kitain, even in combination with Pinard and Graham, does not teach or suggest the structure of Claim 1 wherein "the personal homepage for said member is disabled from any viewing on the Internet network when said employment status data indicates the member is not employed by an organization."

Kitain is generally directed to a "computer-based system and method for the electronic distribution of information, and more particularly, for the distribution of information via the Internet to authorized (entitled) recipients." Kitain, col. 1, ll. 12-16. Kitain provides that prior to receiving information from the disclosed system, a user must have authorization to access such information: "Once the user has provided the ID and password, the repository server will determine what information that user is authorized to receive. According to the present invention, each user has authorization to access all or a subset of the information stored at the repository server." *Id.*, at col. 5, ll. 63-67. The disclosure also indicates that "[d]ifferent users may be permitted to access different subsets of the documents stored at the central repository." *Id.*, at col. 6, ll. 10-11.

Kitain also indicates that while some users may have access to particular information, some users may not have access to that same information: "The present invention allows participating corporations and research providers (i.e., contributors) to dynamically (and "on-line") authorize (entitle) selected users to access selected documents, document groups, and/or hypertext links. Additionally, the contributors may also dynamically (and "on-line") prohibit (disentitle) selected users to access selected documents, document groups, and/or hypertext links." *Id.* at col. 10, ll. 5-14.

Kitain further indicates that access to the disclosed system may be based on a user identification and password combination. For example, in describing the user verification process, Kitain discloses that "[t]he web server 4 executes a subroutine and, using Netscape's NSAPI, receives the ID and password that the investor is asked to provide by the server/browser, and then verifies the ID and password against a database of authorized users (the user database) maintained at the repository server 2. If the user is verified, the Internet browser will be given a verification signature. An investor who is not in the user database, or enters an incorrect password, is denied access to CGI's and web pages on the web server 4 by simply having the subroutine return an "Access Denied" flag to the web server 4." *Id.* at col. 13, ll. 55-67. Thus, if the investor (user) provides the correct set of credentials, the investor will be allowed to access the disclosed system.

In contrast to the system disclosed in Kitain, claim 1 recites "automatically disabling the personal homepage for any viewing on the Internet." Likewise, if the salesperson is transferred to a non-sales position within the organization, data indicative of this status may be entered in the human resources database, which then is used to disable the person's homepage." Application, p. 5, ¶ 0023.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, "all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." See MPEP § 2143.03. Kitain does not disable information from **any viewing** on the Internet. In other words, in contrast to claim 1, Kitain still permits some viewing of information by some users on the Internet, such that the information is NOT disabled from viewing. Kitain discloses that while one user may be prevented from (or disintitled to) accessing the information available residing on the system disclosed in Kitain, another user can have access to that same information. See Kitain, col. 10, ll. 5-14. The system in Kitain discerns between users that provide the correct credentials to access the information residing on the system disclosed in Kitain and those users that do not have the correct credentials to access the information residing on the system. See *Id.* at col. 13, ll. 55-67. The system in Kitain does not disclose that the information residing on the system has been "disabled from any viewing on the Internet." Kitain even states that the "present invention allows investors to access corporate information when the investor wishes to do so." *Id.* at col. 8, ll. 58-59.

Therefore, the combination of Pinard in view of Graham and in further view of Kitain does not teach or suggest the limitation of independent Claim 1 "wherein the personal homepage for said member is disabled from any viewing on the Internet when said employment status data indicates the member is not employed by an organization."

With respect to independent Claim 14, the combination of Pinard in view of Graham and in further view of Kitain does not teach or suggest the limitation of "automatically disabling the personal homepage for any viewing on the Internet when said updated personal data includes data indicating that the member is not employed by the organization." As indicated above, Kitain does not disclose that the information residing on the system disclosed in Kitain has been "disabled from any viewing" on the Internet. In

Application Serial No. 10/087,158
Amendment dated March 22, 2006
Response to Office Action mailed November 28, 2005

contrast to the limitation of independent Claim 14, Kitain discloses that while one user may be prevented from accessing the information available residing on the system disclosed in Kitain, another user can have access to and view that same information. See Kitain, col. 10, ll. 5-14.

Hence, the combination of references does not disclose the recited limitation and independent Claims 1 and 14 are allowable. Dependent Claims 2-3, 5-13, 15-16, and 19-26 are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Therefore, in view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested.

If for any reason the Examiner is not able to allow the application, he is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Marc V. Richards", is written over a horizontal line.

Marc V. Richards
Registration No. 37,921
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200